



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF MENTION.

A very different work from Mr. FORBES's *Thukydides I*, which was briefly noticed in the last number, is Mr. MACAN's edition of Herodotos: *Herodotus, Books IV-VI* (London and New York, Macmillan & Co.), in two volumes, the first volume containing introduction, text and commentary, the second a number of special researches and disquisitions the mere titles of which would tax the space of *Brief Mention*. True, like Mr. FORBES, Mr. MACAN is not a grammarian, and his occasional grammatical notes are out of keeping with the learning, the research and the insight which the editor shows in historical and anthropological matters. Of some thirty-five points of grammar recorded in the index, nearly all are the merest trivialities, and nothing of moment is brought nearer to a solution; nor has any serious attempt been made to master the syntactical usage of Herodotos, which is a very potent element in his style. Indeed, one might learn more from the contrasted handling of article, adjective and substantive in Herodotos and Thukydides than from many pages of rhetoric about the chasm that divides the two authors. He who should be at the pains to watch what Aristotle calls the *ὄγκος* position and the *συντομία* position, and the easy grace of the slipshod position—substantive, article and adjective—would have an insight that might save him from phrase-making. It is, therefore, rather droll, in this dearth of grammatical notes in Mr. MACAN's commentary, to find that he has actually discovered and quoted one monograph, viz. Heiligenstädt, *de enuntiatorum finalium usu Herodoteo*. Why this partiality? There are a number of others he might have found cited in accessible school editions such as STRACHAN's, noticed in A. J. P. XII 388. Irregularities of construction Mr. MACAN is fond of attributing to the excitement of the author, just as one might attribute the peculiar twists and turns of the speech of the Mytileneans in Thuk. III to the embarrassment of the traitorous allies of the Athenians. Now, such explanations are, in my judgment, perfectly admissible, if fortified by exhaustive observations, but they lose their value when they are thrown out with that genial ease which is characteristic of Mr. MACAN and which seems to be a reflex from Herodotos himself. To be sure, the jaunty comment strikes one at times as somewhat affected, and sometimes the genial ease becomes unscholarly slovenliness. It does not mend matters to add the *h* to Hoeck that has been docked from Boeckh, and somehow Palmerius ought not to be Englished by Palmer. The Dublin scholar has earned a right to his own name as Le Paulmier had to his. Of course, every one knows the difficulties that lie in the way. Dr. Holden has cited Leunclavius under several different forms in one of his books, and young American students fresh from the German *seminar* are apt to Latinize honest Richard Dawes after the continental fashion. But when it comes to secondhand erudition, there is no end of marvels, and a dissertation written in English may cite *Bernhardy's griech-*

*ische Literaturgeschichte* as if it were a Latin book. But when we leave grammatical ground there is another MACAN, from whom much is to be learned. Especially interesting in the introduction to the first volume is Mr. MACAN's elaborate analysis of the triad which he has undertaken to edit and the advocacy of the unity of the three books, suggesting as that unity does, the tripartite structure of the work and a ground-plan of the whole. The travels of Herodotos in the regions described in this triad, which may be called the second volume of his history, come next under discussion, and then follows a characterization of the way in which Herodotos handled his material. Here we have criticism and selection, there presentation and creation. For Herodotos is not merely an artist, and after making all necessary deductions Mr. MACAN grants that for us Herodotos is the father of criticism as he is the father of history. And well he might be, for the antique *istoria* involves criticism *ex vi termini*. Herodotos puts his own interpretation on natural phenomena, and a very respectable interpretation it is sometimes, as Huxley and others have shown. 'It is very seldom, if ever,' says Mr. MACAN, 'that individual conduct is explained by Herodotos in a way which is unnatural or psychologically untrue.' On the other hand, he seems to Mr. MACAN to lack political insight, and he ascribes 'the profounder glimpses of policy and political causation, which traverse or illuminate his pages, either to a better source or group of sources, or to the irresistible logic of facts, honestly narrated and recoverable or replaceable in chronological order.' 'The irresistible logic of facts' is a phrase like any other. 'The indifference shown by Herodotos in his rationale of human conduct, for the merely utilitarian motives, may be traced,' says Mr. MACAN, 'at least in part, to two principles. The first is that Herodotos loves a good story and writes for lovers of good stories, for the many rather than the few: he was a *logograph*, not a sophist, and took Homer rather than Anaxagoras for his master.' Surely a *logograph* and not a sophist is a false antithesis. The sophists were famous story-tellers, and this mark of their tribe lasted through all the centuries. It is true of Protagoras—witness the Platonic dialogue of that name: it is true of Lucian. The other principle on which Mr. MACAN lays stress is the supernatural element. Herodotos was a devout man, in a sense; but in a matter involving religious feeling so many attitudes are possible that it is always dangerous to formulate, to categorize. It is perfectly possible to consider the faith of Herodotos as an official faith, a *parti pris* faith, in the face of the unbelief that prevailed so largely in the circles in which Herodotos moved. It is perfectly possible to say that he was a good Church of Greece man. But everything Herodotean is still subject to revision, and however one may differ from Mr. MACAN at various points, he has made a substantial contribution to the study of Herodotos and added new zest to the work of one of the most fascinating, large-minded, artistic and lovable natures in the whole world of classical literature.

---

A couple of years ago KAIBEL favored us with a new edition of *Galen's Protrepticus* (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung), and it was my purpose to call attention to the attractive original and the improved text. Now it is

rather late in the day, but in re-reading it for a special purpose I find occasion to emphasize a lesson which the grammarian, however he may despise the *Graeculi*, must consent to learn. Among the better writers—nay, even among the worse—certain traditions have established themselves that we cannot afford to neglect (comp. f. i. A. J. P. IV 426, note 2), and I am sorry that when I was commenting in a recent number of the Journal (XVI 396) on the foolishness of the teaching in the grammars as to *εἰ μὴ διὰ*, the following passage of the *Protrepticus* was not present to my mind: τίς γὰρ <ἄν> ἦν Στραγιῶν λόγος, εἰ μὴ δι' Ἀριστοτέλην, τίς δ' ἂν Σόλων, εἰ μὴ δι' Ἀρατόν τε καὶ Χρύσιππον (p. 8 K.). An example like this effectually disposes of the ellipsis of a verb of hindering and such stuff.